

United States District Court
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

JENNIFER K. ABBOTT-POPE

Plaintiff,

VS.

TEXAS RECOVERY
BUREAU, INC., et al.

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 4:14CV702
Judge Mazzant/Judge Bush

**MEMORANDUM ADOPTING REPORTS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Came on for consideration the reports of the United States Magistrate Judge in this action, this matter having been heretofore referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On June 1, 2015, the report of the Magistrate Judge was entered containing proposed findings of fact and recommendations that *pro se* Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment Against Beck & Masten Pontiac-GMC, Inc. (**Dkt. #68**), Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment Against HSBC Finance Corporation and HSBC Auto Finance, Inc. (**Dkt. #69**), Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment Against Santander Consumer USA, Inc. (**Dkt. #70**), Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment Against Texas Recovery Bureau, Inc. (**Dkt. #71**), Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment Against Beck & Masten GMC, Inc. for Failure to Answer Plaintiff's First and Second Amended Complaint (**Dkt. #89**), Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment Against HSBC Finance Corporation and HSBC Auto Finance, Inc. for Failure to Answer Plaintiff's First and Second Amended Complaint (**Dkt. #90**), Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment Against Santander Consumer USA, Inc. for Failure to Answer Plaintiff's First and Second

Amended Complaint (**Dkt. #91**), Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment Against Santander Holding USA, Inc. for Failure to Answer Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (**Dkt. #92**), and Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Judgment Against Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC and PRA Receivables Management, LLC for Failure to Answer Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint (**Dkt. #93**) should be **DENIED**. *See* Dkt. #105. No objections were filed.

On June 4, 2015, the report of the Magistrate Judge was entered containing proposed findings of fact and recommendations that for the reasons set forth in the Court's June 1, 2015 report and recommendation, *pro se* Plaintiff's additional motions for default judgment (**Dkts. ##106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114 & 115**) should be **DENIED**. *See* Dkt. #117. No objections were filed.

Having received the reports of the United States Magistrate Judge, and no objections thereto having been timely filed, this court is of the opinion that the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and adopts the Magistrate Judge's recommendations as the findings and conclusions of the court.

Therefore, *pro se* Plaintiff's motions for default judgment (**Dkts. ##68, 69, 70, 71, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114 & 115**) are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 14th day of July, 2015.


AMOS L. MAZZANT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE